DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 325 HE 025 221

AUTHOR Heckman, Dale M.
TITLE Six Parallel Policy Changes in Higher Education in California and the Soviet Union in the 1980's.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Certification; Comparative Education; *Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; *Educational Development; Educational Quality; Enrollment; Ethnic Groups; Higher Education; International Educational Exchange; *Policy Formation; Social Change; Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS California; USSR

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the fact that, in the same decade and despite obvious differences, two separate and distinctive systems of higher education (those of California and the Soviet Union) have been urged by their respective policy making bodies, to make major changes in at least six parallel ways; the paper investigates reasons for this timing and parallelism. After identifying the half dozen issues and the stated reasons for each policy change, the first and longer part of the document discusses these changes in terms of internal factors associated with very recent changes (1960s and 1970s) in American higher education, and the extent to which these factors seem present in the Soviet or California institutions. The six changes that are examined are as follows: (1) increased collaboration among academic, research, and industrial units; (2) improved quality and selected characteristics of students graduating from postsecondary institutions; (3) getting ethnic minorities enrolled in proportion to the population; (4) involvement of volunteers in social improvement; (5) obtaining of government certification of institutional quality; and (6) increased international exchange of students. Also presented are the four societal conditions, and their examples, that are commonly correlated with large-scale policy changes in the history of American higher education. In the paper's second part, correlates of internal change in institutions of higher education are examined for their relevance to the California-Soviet comparison. These changes are: openness to external initiatives; changes in faculty composition; fewer faculty members with tenure; and dispersed power and influence among faculty members. It is concluded that despite sharp ideological differences, important parallels do exist between the two societies, and that their anxieties for the future, as reflected in the educational changes both have instituted, transcend their more explicit differences. Contains 28 footnotes. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341325

Six Parallel Policy Changes in Higher Education in California and the Soviet Union in the 1980's

-- Dale M. Heckman

(1991)

Introduction

In 1987 the Soviet government adopted a policy statement which announced sweeping changes to be made in Soviet higher education during the next decade. In that statement, "Basic Guidelines for Rebuilding Higher . . . Education in the U.S.S.R."[1] there appear six issues which closely parallel official concerns at the state policy-making level in California, concerns for making shifts in these same areas in public higher education in California.[2] Thus in the same time period in both regions of the world, quite similar changes of policy have occurred in regard to these six issues. The actual changes in the two respective systems are to be realized during approximately the same time period, from 1987 through the decade of the 1990's.

Other observers of higher education systems have noted that, at least among developed industrial countries, these systems now appear to grow steadily more alike. T. Husen finds such a tendency, for a recent example, and J. Guthrie comments that current economic forces

> "may well [result in] a remarkable international convergence among many of the systemic components of schooling, both higher and lower education."[3]

HE 025 221

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DALE HECKMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper, however, is not a further comment on "convergence" theories; rather, the term "parallel" (and not likely to converge in the future) has been chosen deliberately. Nor does this paper presume to provide a general comparison of two higher education systems -- their similarities and major differences. This paper simply takes note of the curious fact that, in the same decade and despite obvious differences, two separate and distinctive systems of higher education have been urged by their respective policy making bodies, to make major changes in at least six parallel ways, and it probes after reasons for this timing and parallelism. Of course individual similarities between different systems would occasion little or no surprise. What calls attention to itself is the pattern. Furthermore, nothing here implies that one system has copied the other.

Since Soviet and American/Californian systems of higher education differ from one another in major ways, such a parallelism of policy changes prompts analysis to see what common factors brought all these matters to the policy agendas of both systems at the same time, and why both have dealt with these issues in similar directions. Evidently these factors operate with relative independence from the official ideologies of their respective states.

After identifying the half dozen issues and the stated reasons for each policy change, this paper will discuss them in terms of internal factors associated with very recent changes (1960's, 1970's) in American higher education, and the extent to which these factors seem present in the Soviet or California institutions now.

In general, the discussion drives toward finding predictors of successful change, but no claim is made to have found such predictors in this brief inquiry.

Moreover, it is not presumed that success or failure of these policy changes -- in either place -- can be predicted with assurance. But there are factors known to have been associated with previous successful policy changes in American public higher education systems, and these recurring factors exhibit some independence from ideological differences between the host societies. From these sources, after further research, there may emerge one or more predictors of actual institutional change. It is known that long preparation and discussion, involving educational and economic scholars, preceded the issuance of the 1986-87 Soviet policy document. An important working assumption for the concluding section of this paper is that the profound political changes of 1990-91 do not necessarily nullify these educational policies by the (former) Soviet authorities. (Se note #1.)

I. Parallel Policy Changes, USSR and California Higher Education Systems, Late-1980's

Since 1985, the governments of both the Soviet Union and the State of California have publicly declared new policies toward making significant changes in their respective higher education systems.[4]

Table 1 lists six issues in contemporary higher education on which policy decisions have been made during the mid-1980's in both the USSR (central government) and California (state government). In two additional columns the table provides documentary references and brief quotations to indicate the direction of each policy change.

These six issues and policy changes are as follows.

(a) Increase collaboration among academic, research, and industrial units.

A current axiom in both societies holds that technological and economic changes have accelerated the need to ensure that theoretical findings pertinent to production have a quick route to the testing of their applicability and then to acceptance into the bloodstream of industrial production or of professional practice.[5] Likewise, academe needs the feedback information on how its ideas play out in their applied forms in particular places.

Both in California and in Soviet policy actions in the 1980's one finds decisions to encourage an acceleration of "technology transfer" between higher education and industry, especially in Siberia. In both places -- California and USSR (esp. Siberia), -- noted archetypal models for this process exist; the new policies simply direct that they should accelerate or expand.

Table 1.

Policy Change Parallels -- U.S.S.R. Siberia and California*
Aspects of Higher Education Which Have Been Identified
in Official Policy for Change in Similar Direction 1980 -- 1995

Policy Change Desired	New Soviet Policy and Ref.	New Calif. Policy and Ref.
1. Closer collaboration between higher educ. institutions and industrial enterprises; faster "technology transfer" and job readiness.	ONPV 1236f; Siberia had 4 + Teaching/Research/Production complexes (Akademgorodoks) by 1989; policy is to increase such development faster.	Cochran: Technology Transfer pet., 1987, Cal. Dept. of Commerce. SB 349 (1989 Alquist): Dept. of Commerce et al study toward new h. educ.-industry center in Asia. Also: Chico State U. Regional Ctr. for Economic Development.
2. Improve quality of graduates (in USSR, "specialists," in U.S., "bachelors degree recipients") by cultivating: (a) adaptability, via broader subj.-matter, integrative; (b) ability to make bold decisions and implement them; (c) ability to confer and communicate widely, continue	ONPV 130f. "More individual instruct'l) approach . . . broader profile (curricul.) 135: "ability for bold decision-making" & follow-through; know a foreign lang.; 143: "eradicate dogmatism, react sensitively to real-world changes" esp. in Soc. Sciences. TSTR: Analyzes new need for	CFCF "Emphas. broad & gen'l. educ., (abil.) to integrate & synthesize . . ., fully develop individuals' analytic capacities, and moral/ethical sensibilities." Individual autonomy . . . informed by deep community responsibility" "To know better those peoples & nations w/whom we share the globe, need become bilingual ci-

Table 1 (continued)	broadly educatged, required by rapid technological changes and effects.	at home and abroad." LDUC: "a 3rd stage: integration, synthesis, global learning."
3. More equitable access to higher educ. for all qualified applicants, regardless of origin, etc.	ONPV 134f.: "increase objectivity of competitive selection (for admiss.) yet observe principle of social justice."	AB 101 (1987, Chacon): All segments of public educ. to report progress/efforts toward educational equity. "Expanding Educ'l. Equity in Calif. Schools & Colleges," report of policy taskforce, 1986.
4. More involvement of students in societal efforts and civic needs.	ONPV 125f, 142: "to shape superior civic and moral qualities . . . step up socio-political practical activities . . . and sport work w/children and youth.	AB 1820 (Vasconcellos, 1987) "long tradition of students' participation in community service should be . . . expanded to help nurture . . . sense of human community and social responsibility," and because public funds are not meeting the public's needs.
5. Government to exercise responsibility for certifying institution's quality.	ONPV 159: "Control functions of USSR Ministry H. Educ. & inspectorate for teaching qual. to be strengthened, and certification of institutions of h. educ. introduced."	SB 190 (Morgan 1989) "Recognizing . . . non-governmental accreditation while not ceding to that . . . the responsibility for state oversight/approval. . ."

Table 1 (continued)

6. More international exchange of students and instructional staff.	ONPV 163: "Nurture new generation of specialists in spirit of . . . friendship among peoples" . . . "Strengthen cooperation between h. educ. institutions of socialist countries . . .	LDUC: "Process of internationalization (in Calif.) pervasive and profound . . . Augment (current) programs of internat'l exchange of students and faculty . . . Add courses interdisciplinary and w/multicult'l or global dimension." CFCF: "Need establish closer, sustained relationships w/overseas institutions . . ."

Notes:

* In the U.S.A. the primary responsibility for education policy and support remains at the level of each individual state; hence, appropriate comparison here is between policies of Soviet central government and a leading state of the U.S.

ONPV = "Osnovniye Napravlenie Perestroiki Vysshego Shkoli v Stranye" (Basic Guidelines for Restructuring of Higher Education . . . in the Soviet Union), 1987, Moscow Policy statement adopted by the Paty and Soviet government in 1987. Page references are to the English translation in Soviet Education (journal), July 1987.

TSTR = Turchenko: "The Scientific and Technological Revolution and the Revolution in Education"; 1976, Novosibirsk. Although this is not an official policy document, the date and distribution of this monograph by a prominent Siberian academician suggest it wielded considerable influence among those then rising toward policy positions.

AB__ = Assembly Bill, accompanied by number, author, and year filed (California legisl.)

SB Senate Bill, accompanied by number, author, and year filed (California legisl.)

CFCF "California Faces California's Future"; Sacramento, 1988; report of Joint Legislative Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

LDUC = "Lower Division Education in the University of California"; June 1986 report of University Task Force, Prof. Neil Smelser, Chair.

In 1987 the State of California's Department of Commerce published a report entitled simply, Technology Transfer (Cochran).[6] Two years later the State Legislature asked the Department of Commerce to lead a study toward establishing a joint "higher education and industry center" in Asia. Meanwhile, two State agencies helped to establish at a public university campus an office for assisting the business firms of a large region to utilize information and expertise in the nearby higher education institutions. In California the archetypal academic industrial complex is the "Silicon Valley," south of Stanford University.

At Novosibirsk, 900 miles east of the Ural Mountains, stands the Soviet archetype of an academic-research-industrial complex. Planted there three decades ago, this complex called "Akademgorodok" (Academic Town) at first juxtaposed teaching and research institutions, but has been joined more recently by offices of actual production entities. As a model, Akademgorodok has been replicated in four or more other locations of Siberia. While the 1987 policy document does not mention Akademgorodok(s) by name, it does directly urge multiplying such complexes for making quicker use of theoretical and experimental findings of higher education.[7]

Thus governing authorities in both California and the USSR have decided and publicly stated there is need for wider and faster collaboration in the next decade between higher education and industry. Both have determined that government must facilitate such a speed-up based on a sense of economic urgency.

(b) Improve quality and selected characteristics of students graduating from postsecondary institutions.

The quality of education beyond secondary school attracted high level and concerted attention during the 1980's in both California and the USSR. What is more interesting, several specific subtopics of "quality" also appear in both regions.

For instance, California employers and policy-makers expressed need for graduates who can synthesize and integrate what they learn. Knowledge of one's surrounding context, it is said, often becomes as important in the practical realm as one's deeply specialized knowledge. Thus, a Joint Legislative Committee in Sacramento called in its 1988 report for an emphasis on

> "broad and general education, (the ability to) integrate and synthesize. . ., and fully develop the individual's analytic capacities. . ."[8]

The Soviet policy-makers in 1987 called repeatedly for curricula of "broader profile" and the ability to "react sensitively to real-world changes."[9]

Likewise, the concern for improving quality overall leads the policy-makers in both regions on a quest for more self-assured, continuing learners who are more adaptable and flexible in the face of changes in technology and society. Soviet leaders want to produce a "greater ability for bold decision-making" in their future managers, people who have experienced a "more individualized instructional approach," and have the personal fortitude for "follow-through" with their own carefully formulated decisions. For this to succeed there is need, said the Soviets, to "eradicate dogmatism," a rigid and fixed way of arriving at decisions. The California Joint Committee, similarly, called for development of "individual autonomy. . ." in the young new student generations ahead.

On both sides, reasons include personal, developmental needs, which in turn may be seen as political perceptions as well as economic/production perceptions.

Another facet of the concern for quality has to do with improving knowledge about the world beyond one's own borders, including the ability to communicate effectively in another language.

The Joint Committee, in California Faces California's Future (CFCF), clearly wants college graduates

> "to know better those peoples and nations with whom we share the globe, (and) to become bilingual citizens to communicate effectively at home and abroad."[10]

And the both senior segments of public higher education in California's system have set, in this latter-half decade, more stringent requirements in foreign languages for undergraduates.

For California a stiffer policy for foreign language acquisition marks an abrupt change; for the Soviet Union, however, a similar stiffening marks a surprising acknowledgement. The Soviet system traditionally has devoted more attention to such matters either at the secondary or postsecondary levels of education. So its new call for all students to "know a foreign language" -- while not one of the main emphases in the new document -- offers unexpected evidence that the traditional policy was not succeeding. Its context relates it to the need to "react sensitively to real-world changes" mentioned above.[11]

One important instance of systemic problems stemming from lack of second language proficiency in the USSR appears in a severe shortage of school teachers able to teach in the schools of certain "indigenous peoples" of the northern regions.[12] The new policy does not say this, nor will it necessarily solve this problem. The single example is part of the general background conditions. Nevertheless, there is reason for surprise in this parallelism of policies regarding foreign language proficiency and global knowledge.

Policy-makers in both regions express new concern about improving the moral/ethical qualities of their college graduates. The California Legislature's Joint Committee chose to mention such personal development in discussing "broad and general education" as a way of developing more fully an individual's "moral and ethical sensibilities."[13] It clearly relates this, however, to civic participation and social roles. The Soviet policy document ties the government's desire "to shape superior civic and moral qualities" to a policy of increased involvement of students in various volunteer societal efforts. Although couched in terminology of official doctrine, the basic concerns and even the changes proposed sound similar.

Overall, it can be seen that even in important details the Soviet and Californian concerns for policy changes in the name of improving the "quality" of their college graduates run parallel to one another. Both express a mixture of individual personal development and society's need as their rationale for change. On both sides one could argue, of course, that these changes relate solely to economic needs. But societal and political stability concerns seem operant here, as well.

(c) Enroll ethnic minorities in proportion to population

One of the ironies to emerge in this comparison is that two historic champions of egalitarianism both are finding difficulties with getting their ethnic/national minority peoples to enroll in and complete higher education at rates somewhere near their proportion in the population. In both California and the USSR the fact that some "ethnic minorities" (California) or "indigenous peoples" (USSR) have not attained proportionate enrollments in higher education has aroused much concern. It is not solely an ethical problem but also a political one, in both cases.

The language of the Soviet policy guidelines (1987) remains noticeably indirect on this point. It speaks of the need to

"increase the objectivity of competitive selection" (read: no favoritism for children of officials?) and "yet observe the principle of social justice"[14] (read: equitable treatment for minority applicants).

In California, extensive public discussion has been devoted to the need for improved and equitable access to higher education, and public policy has generally supported this principle for many years. The new, 1987 policy via statute requires "all segments of public higher education to report their progress toward educational equity,"[15] and reflects wide dissatisfaction with the actual progress measured. Current demographics indicate that the Caucasian majority will soon become one of the many minority groupings in California's population. In the Soviet Union, meanwhile, population trends in several of the major regions indicate that Great Russians there soon will be outnumbered by other ethnic groups.[16] In both places, the Caucasian majority now expresses official concern about whether, when a different ethnic coalition takes political dominance, the same society still will be in capable hands. The passage of generations -- independent of ideology!

(d) Volunteers involved in social improvement.

Both California and the USSR depend for numerous functions on volunteer -- or at least un-paid -- efforts. Now both societies express considerable anxiety about the willingness of their youth to put unpaid shoulders to the wheel and take part in the public tasks of their own societies. In both regions at the official level, people began to feel through the 1980's that young adults exhibited a decline of civic commitment and an increase in anomie.

In California during this period admiration had grown for the success of the California Conservation Corps -- a disciplined and uniformed body of outdoor working groups which attracted youths needing time and temporary support for "finding themselves." Then a legislator crafted a proposal for encouraging students into quasi-paid community work while attending college; this organized effort, the "Human Corps," found bipartisan support for it in the Legislature, and continues as a popular state project.[17]

In the USSR, likewise, youth and young adults during this period showed more than ordinary inclination to disengage from their society's official agenda. Komsomol influence waned, applications to higher education institutions declined significantly, and western rock/pop music attracted youth like a new Pied Piper. Environmentalism became one of the few national causes with much attractiveness to youth. In its 1987 policy statement the authorities found it timely, in or-

der "to shape superior civic and moral qualities (among students)," . . ."to step up sociopolitical practical activities. . . and sport work with children and youth."[18]

In both societies the policy-makers of higher education thus acknowledged the importance of other-directed activities of their young adults, countering a perceived trend toward self-gratification. Such concern, too, transcends political ideologies, and has continued since the age of Socrates.

(e) Government certification of institution quality.

Both governments have left to other entities the function of warranting the quality of higher education institutions -- that is, their quality as actually encountered by students. Now they both find reason to reassert responsibility for that function.

This move reflects a growing criticism directed at these respective governments by others, especially by prominent persons on the production side of the domestic economy. It relates, to the policy change mentioned above with regard to the quality of education which current graduates carry into their places of work. (Cf. "(b)" above.)

In the case of California, the State government recently reaffirmed its own ultimate responsibility to vouch for the quality of all independent colleges and universities in the state.[19] Those institutions that voluntarily participate in a multistate (regional) process of mutual accreditation have long been exempted from further inspection by the State. But the remaining unaccredited privately-run institutions form a large segment in the overall system still permitted to offer degrees. As of 1991, a new commission reporting directly to the Legislature will oversee quality control in this unaccredited sector. Meanwhile a new State-level study has begun to examine the regional accreditation processes as well.

The legislation which embodies this new policy stance expresses the "intent of the Legislature to . . .foster and improve" the institutions it addresses "while protecting the citizens. . . from fraudulent or substandard operations." It also assures that the Legislature wishes to continue to encourage nongovernmental accreditation "while not ceding to . . . any nongovernmental process the responsibility" for upholding the minimum quality standards.

The Soviet statement simply directs that the "control functions of the (USSR) Ministry of Higher . . . Education and the inspectorate for the quality of teaching are to be strengthened, and certification of institutions of higher education is to be

introduced."[20] In its general introductory background section, however, the ONPV brings up the fragmentation of institutions and needless proliferation of similar programs as one cause of the dilution of quality. The fact that many higher specialized institutes come under the jurisdiction of several separate ministries and agencies, "30 of which are responsible for only one or two institutes each," has led to a great dilution of educational quality as, for example, a proper balance of academic/theoretical with applied/practical knowledge, or lack of exposure to current technologies and methods.

In both societies, therefore, a perception of government's culpability for the declining effectiveness of institutions has led to a decision to form more direct linkages between the institutions and the central governing body through some new process of quality certification. In the California case, the justification includes references to fraud and to protection of citizens from it; in the Soviet case, the justification cites fragmentation which results in falling behind educationally and technologically.

(f) Increase international exchange of students.

Both the Soviet and California authorities have demonstrated fresh interest in improving the global knowledge, understanding, and functioning of their students; both have exercised notable caution in choosing official words about this.

In the Soviets' policy document (ONPV), the first emphasis falls upon strengthening "cooperation between higher education institutions of socialist countries." But it is closely followed by expressions of a more general desire for "the nurturing of a new generation of specialists (read: college graduates) in the spirit of social progress, peace, and friendship among peoples."[21] The official Gorbachev policy basis held that traditional modes of defense, based mainly on military power and annihilistic terror, are no longer tenable and have been outmoded by a "new way of thinking." This must include active international cooperation on global problems.

In actual practice, activities such as new student exchange visits of undergraduates to western countries have increased abruptly since 1987; both students and instructors have come in new numbers to California institutions.

In California, on the other hand, no single State-level policy provides guidance in this matter for all of public higher education. Indeed a recent governor twice vetoed legislative proposals for additional international exchanges of students, explaining that those were "foreign policy" initiatives and therefore federal concerns. Yet there has emerged a set of public incentives for students to pay great-

er attention to international matters. The most prominent instance is the State allocation of funds for a new graduate school of international/Pacific rim studies within the University of California, San Diego (1986). A 1986 internal report calls upon the University of California to "augment (its) programs of international exchange of students and faculty."[22] In 1986 the Legislature called upon the 3 public segments of higher education in California to report on their activities that pertain directly to Pacific Rim countries. Public justification for nearly all of the initiatives has been couched in terms either of economic "competitiveness" or of the multicultural society within California's own population. Within a narrow set of public and private institutions, important changes certainly have been made in the last decade to enhance the actual exposure of undergraduate students to other nations and cultures. But explicit policy about this tends to reside in the separate segments or institutions, as a curricular matter.

In general, it is easier at this moment to find among policy-makers rhetorical expressions of interest in developing international skills than it is to acquire the funds and languages needed to help students use exchange opportunities. In both countries, nevertheless, new conditions -- largely economic yet with new hopes for easing away from military or societal disaster -- have stimulated a resurgence of interest in pursuing international experience for students at the undergraduate level.

In the above-listed aspects of higher education slated for change, the policy-makers have expressed predominantly similar perceptions of the need for changes and reasons for making corresponding changes in policy: the economy in an age of accelerating changes in technology and production, a conviction about the increasing role of postsecondary education in matching that acceleration, an explicit anxiety that the emerging society requires more, not fewer, fully developed persons strongly identified with their society yet able to carry out their responsibilities with personal autonomy and courage. These concerns clearly show through the 1980's policies of the two differing modern societies. At least in their public expression, the policy-makers in these two regions of the world seem to have identified reasons for change which transcend their differing ideologies.

Table 2*

FOUR SOCIETAL CONDITIONS COMMONLY CORRELATED WITH LARGE-SCALE POLICY CHANGES IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

TYPE OF CONDITION:	EXAMPLE OF CHANGE:
1. Great and abrupt demographic shifts in population	
Example: Western expansion in latter half of 1800's (Calif. gold-rush, transcont'l. rr., etc.), w/perceived need to "settle" -- establish order and industry.	Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, estab'd. "Agric.& Mining" and "Agric.& Tech'l" institutions.
Example: Children of G.I. veterans of World War II portend a large wave of applications for Calif. higher education institutions, beyond capacity, 1960's.	Calif. Legislature adopts "Master Plan for Higher Education, 1960" to guide rapid growth/building of 5-tiered system, postsecondary education.
2. Rapid shift of technological base of economy	
Example: Dispersion of electrical power sources, subseq. dispersion of light industry w/ needs for more educated personnel; esp. mid-20th Century, 1930's onward.	Wide acceptance by State of relation between higher educ. & economic progress/prosperity; principle of public h. educ. at low/nocost to any able youth established at State level.
Example: Post-WWar II aeronautics, energy, electronics revolutions and new industries (milit. & civ. mix)	Federal peace-time support for scientific research in selected universities, &rise of "research university" as a class of instit'n.
3. Pervasive sense of sociopolitical crisis	
Example: "Sputnik" launch by USSR w/ revelation to U.S. public that "Russians are smarter. . . " w/ background of "Cold War" military competition; 1957, 1958.	Swift passage of Nat'l. Defense Education Act, 1958,w/ federal funds emphasizing teaching of science, math., internat'l studies, for. languages, & teachers. Incl.prepar'n for teaching in higher education.
4. Shift of popular human expectations or "rights" or "roles" perceptions	
Example: Overwhelming of slavery as legitimate practice (latter half, 19th Cent. US & Russia.	Establishment of colleges open to all and esp. freed slaves, both public & private support.
Example: Equality of women extended to economic realm; concept widely disseminated in late 1960's, decade of 1970's.	Civil Rights Act, 1964, amended 1972 to include "gender equality"--applied to college budget, athletics, etc.

* **Not discussed in text of this article.** This table displays a partial list of historical conditions in American society, **external** to higher education, which accompanied or help cause major changes in higher education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. INTERNAL CORRELATES OF CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Those who have analyzed internal changes in American organizations -- in this case, academic organizations -- tend to agree that important reforms or experimental changes rarely occur without some major external initiative or impetus. A large gift for a designated purpose, stipulation attached to the annual state budget appropriation, a prestigious "study" report, or even a public scandal -- such external forces seem critical for overcoming natural internal resistances to serious change in academic institutions.[23]

Such external initiatives, it must be added, usually depend upon information and insight that originates inside the institution. Large gifts as well as student protests tend to occur partly as responses -- however wise or unwise -- to views held by those in charge of the institution.

Within institutions themselves, however, there clearly are factors which make some institutions more receptive to academic change than others. These aspects of the institutions have been found to accompany actual changes, beyond changes of policies.

Several studies of change factors within American higher education institutions were published between 1965 and 1975. Among them, Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch reported Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971, a study carried out for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.[24] Meanwhile, J.B. Hefferlin, Earl McGrath et al led a trilogy of studies reported in Hefferlin, Dynamics of Academic Reform, 1969 (Jossey-Bass).[25] The particular changes or "reforms" focussed on by Hefferlin and team were curricular and other factors directly related to undergraduate instructional programs. The following discussion will make use of findings from these two major studies of actual changes in American higher education institutions.

The guiding question is whether any of the identified change factors from the 1960's American experience (a) are present now in Soviet or California institutions, and (b) have any usefulness in helping to predict success for the new policies in either country.

Overall, four correlates of academic change identified by these previous studies may prove relevant to this present comparison:

1. Initiative/impulse comes from sources external to the institution of higher education; and institution exhibits "openness" to change;

2. Change in composition of faculty, either through turnover or through increased number of positions, is relatively high;

3. Fewer faculty members hold tenure (in the more dynamic institutions);

4. Decision-making power is relatively dispersed, rather than centralized, and more locally-focussed than remote from institution or campus.

1. Openness to External Initiative.

Certainly the Soviet policy change document (1987) represents an initiative from outside higher education institutions; some of the announced changes in funding and in the authority of rectors have already begun to occur in actuality. It has been pointed out earlier, moreover, that some of the proposed "changes" -- e.g., higher education/industry collaborative complexes -- amount to affirmation and encouragement to emulate models that have completed a long pilot-testing and have already begun to multiply in some regions of the USSR. Thus, while the new initiative comes from outside, direct knowledge of what it promotes already is widespread among institutions.

In California through the State budget process for public institutions, external initiatives have become, if anything, more common within the past decade. In community colleges, of whose support the State's proportion of funding has doubled, involvement of the Legislature seems inevitable; in the State University segment, the State continues as the source for most financial support. Legislators, meanwhile, do not seem to have diminished in their willingness, even zeal, to accomplish further goals through the State-funded institutions of education.

In both societies the pressure for "outside industrial/professional" sources to play an increased role in setting curricular and quality criteria grew markedly during the 1980's. And the publication of research-based advocacy statements by various associations has not abated in California, and could now increase also in the USSR.

Thus, the general phenomenon of initiative from external sources for change seems fully present. The extent to which outside proposals are followed by outside financial support remains, of course, to be seen and its probability is always

part of this factor. Economic conditions in both societies grew drastically worse after the policy changes had been adopted.

2. Change in composition of faculty.

The 1990's will find California institutions pressed hard to recruit sufficient numbers of qualified faculty members to replace those now reaching retirement. This has already become a matter of official public concern, and is on the State's agenda, all the more as it contemplates further enrollment growth in the same period.[26]

In the USSR the supply of qualified applicants for faculty positions is as yet unclear; but if the rectors in fact receive the added authority proposed for them, there could occur a considerable turnover. The director of the national Institute for Research on Higher Education (Moscow), Alexander Savel'iev, asserts that:

> "If appropriate measures are not taken, the staffing of higher education institutions will soon be one of the weak points in the reform plan . . . According to sociological studies, 57 percent of all faculty members (in Soviet VUZy) do not have adequate professional knowledge, 37 percent do not have an appropriate level of culture, and 39 percent do not have proper contacts (i.e., interaction) with their students."[27]

In addition, according to Savel'iev,

> "Higher education and academic employment have undergone a significant loss of prestige," (and VUZy) "are having to deal with an aging staff."

A sample of rectors, one should add, participated in the above-mentioned "sociological studies" rating the capabilities of current faculty members.

Elsewhere, Saval'iev mentions the likely 'brain-drain" of scholars to other countries in the difficult transition period of the 1990s. Many hope that does not become a hemorrhage.

Will this new condition work for change or stagnation? At the present moment it seems easier to generalize about able scholars leaving Soviet academia than about the new talent which must be attracted into teaching positions in the 1990s. It is known there has been turnover among the rectors of institutions in the most recent five years. There is,moreover, officially no tenure in Soviet higher education even though the apparatus is said to have functioned as if there

were. The new decade would seem to guarantee unusual faculty turnover in both societies, yet the overall migration of scholars during this transitional period also could create a great vacuum to be filled by the least flexible.

3. Fewer faculty members with tenure.

As mentioned above, Soviet higher education officially has no such practice as tenure; it officially has a reconsideration of each faculty member every five years. If rectors receive the new authority promised in the policy document, there should be even less opportunity for "tenure-by-inertia" than may presently operate.[28]

In California higher education, however, the impending shortage of qualified, home-grown faculty prospects will likely increase the temptation of departments and schools to include an offer of early tenure in order to compete with other institutions in hiring.

4. Dispersed Power, Influence.

Hefferlin found that faculty members in the more dynamic colleges had a relatively greater sense of agency (i.e. of effective participation) in curricular decisions. Gross and Grambsch found that, from 1964 to 1971, the sense of participatory "power" had become more dispersed through the various strata of the (68) large universities they studied. While large universities seem to resist curricular changes for undergraduates more successfully than institutions that are primarily for undergraduate students, the Gross/Grambsch finding may fit well with Hefferlin's for that period of unusual change.

Certainly, in whatever fields that tend to be technology-intensive, the present time affords younger faculty members, students and new administrators some competitive advantage in arguments for curricular change. And the expectation, both in California and Soviet institutions, of larger proportions of minority-group students, lends weight on the side of some kinds of curricular proposals. Overall, there is a high probability of this "dispersion of power" factor being present now in both California and Soviet institutions of higher education.

CONCLUSION

It has been shown that both California and the Soviet Union have adopted policies for changes in their public higher education institutions regarding at least six distinct issues; both have taken action on these during the same 5-year period and, generally, in the same directions. In many or most instances, very similar rationales have been offered in support of these changes.

It further has been shown that several particular correlates of academic change within American colleges -- not "causes" but at least "sources" according to Hefferlin et. al. -- during the 1960's now again seem present in California undergraduate institutions as well as in some Soviet ones.

It remains to be seen, of course, whether over the next several years the new policies will lead to actual changes at the level of institutions and students. Some of the policy changes have already been followed by actual institutional changes -- for example, in the curriculum -- and others are in progress. Many seem to vary widely by institution (VUZ). Certainly the current economic crises in both California and the former USSR will wield a heavy influence on these outcomes for some time to come, and will continue as the primary **external** factor influencing change. But **within** the institutions themselves, judging by those past (1960's) American change factors examined here, the stage seems to be set for the kinds of dramatic change that have been called for in both societies.

What does all this policy parallelism mean? Certainly it helps to underscore that diverse policy change for higher education can occur in a manner relatively independent of the ideological differences which marked American - Soviet official relations for four decades. The economies of these two host societies differed both in their structure and in their levels of prosperity; yet clearly, a serious concern for the immediate economic future helped to drive both California and the USSR to design urgent changes in their systems of higher education.

Both societies seem to have concluded that to excel in the new technological milieu their people must be more like the "well-rounded" autonomous persons featured in college brochures of a time gone by than like the narrowly specialized automatons portrayed in science fiction.

Both societies, despite other differences, here express some uncertainty about the strength of commitment in their academic elite youth to the spirit of voluntary community effort. Perhaps this latter anxiety is nothing more than the dismay expressed in most adult generations from ancient times about their younger challengers. Or perhaps it reflects that , with modern communications technology, restrictive or national ideological norms have become useless in the face of

norms determined more by the shifting worldwide youth culture. In any case this anxiety of these two societies would seem to transcend more explicit ideological differences.

Although their policy changes have been dominated by economic concerns, it is not exclusively so; they also reveal worries about social disintegration, and hopes that higher education institutions can help cure it. This points to a final observation: that the higher education system of a society is now regarded as an essential pillar, not only of its economy but also as a means of passing the meanings of that human society to the young.

Footnotes:

The author, Dale M. Heckman, is a senior policy researcher and writer with the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Sacramento. He holds a Ph.D. in higher education and ethics. Independently he pursues a longitudinal study of higher education changes in Siberia and the Soviet Far East, and conducted initial on-site interviews on a solo visit to eight institutions from Novosibirsk to Khabarovsk in fall, 1986. A previous paper from this study appears as Chapter VII, "Changing Higher Education in Siberia -- Soviet Pacific Hopes," in D. Whittaker (ed.): International Relations, National Policies and Higher Education in the Pacific Region; University of British Columbia, Vancouver; February 1990. (Proceedings of Pacific Region Association for Higher Education, 1989.)

1. Hereinafter referred to as "ONPV," originally published as osnovniye napravleniya perestroiki vysshego i srednego spetsial'nogo obrazovaniya v stranye; Moscow, Vysshaia Shkola (publisher), 1987. (71 pp. incl. appendices.).

   Despite the major upheaval and changes continuing in the political and economic spheres of the former Soviet Union, this paper assumes (as of early 1992) that the policy change directions of 1986-87 for higher education still carry much force. The reasons supporting this assumption include: (a) the fact that educational leaders took part significantly in forming, critiquing, and refining the new policy document over a considerable time period; and (b) the fact that economic changes since 1987 serve only to underscore the urgency for some or most of the changes proposed for VUZy. The means for implementing the new policies, however, have become even more problematic in 1990-91.

   Page references in ONPV, in these notes, refer to the English translation published in Soviet Education (jrnl) July/August 1987, as 'Fundamental Guidelines for Restructuring Higher and Secondary Specialized Education in the Country."

2. See Table 1, pg. 3 for abbreviated listing of the six issues and its footnoted list of sources used as policy documentation.

   For policy study, comparing a whole country (USSR) with a single state (California) of the USA stems from the fact that in America the primary responsibility for education policy and support resides in each individual state. Thus, the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) recently requested California, and not the federal government of the USA, to participate in its 1987-88 survey of higher education systems in selected countries.

3. James Guthrie and Torsten Husen both mentioned such a convergence in presentations to the 1990 annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Anaheim California. Cf. James W. Guthrie, "The World's Evolving Political Economy and the Emerging Globalization of Education," (unpublished), University of California, Berkeley; 22 March 1990. (21 pp.)

4. In the USSR, these new policies appear in one document (cf. Note 2, above), whereas in California the changes addressed here occurred through several legislative bills and one joint committee report. See list and abbreviations under Table 1.

5. See, for example, the summary report by SRI International: The Higher Education -- Economic Development Connection; for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.,; 1986. See esp. Chapter 2 and the citations in its bibliography under "University/Industry Relations."

6. Cochran, Chris: Technology Transfer; California Department of Commerce, Sacramento; 1987.

7. ONPV, pp. 126f.

8. Joint Legislative Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education: California Faces California's Future; Sacramento; 1988. Hereafter in these notes: CFCF. This committee, representing both houses of the State Legislature, was established by Assembly Concurrent Resolution 162 in 1984.

9. ONPV, pp. 132f., 135, 143.

10. CFCF, p. 89.

11. ONPV, p. 135. Section heading is: "IV. Specialist training . . . commensurate with contemporary demands."

12. See Boborykin, A.D., "Podgotovka pedagogicheskikh kadrov dlya natsional'nykh shkol krainego severa," (Preparation of teaching personnel for national schools of the northern region), in Problemy sovremennogo sotsial'nogo narodnostei severa; Nauka (publisher), Novosibirsk; 1987. (Problems of contemporary nationalities of the north).

13. CFCF, p. 86f.

14. ONPV, p. 134f.

15. Assembly Bill 101 (Chacon, 1987).

16. Nigel Grant, "Linguistic and Ethnic Minorities in the U.S.S.R.," Chap. 2 in tomiak (ed.): Soviet Education in the 1980s; Croom-Helm Ltd., Australia; 1983.

17. Assembly Bill 1820 (Vasconcellos, 1987); also CFCF, p. 90.

18. ONPV, pp. 125, 145.

19. Senate Bill 190 (Morgan, 1989).

20. ONPV, p. 159.

21. ONPV, p. 163.

22. In University of California (internal) Task Force Report, "Lower Division Education in the University of California," (Prof. Neil Smelser, chairman of task force); Berkeley, 1986. See also CFCF, p. 88ff.

23. J.B. Hefferlin: Dynamics of Academic Reform; Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco; 1969, among other places.

24. E. Gross and P. Grambsch: Changes in University Organization, 1964 - 1971; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and McGraw-Hill Co., N.Y.; 1974.

25. The Hefferlin, et al studies focussed on academic changes in American undergraduate institutions -- courses, majors, degree programs, etc. -- and correlates of those changes. Gross and Grambsch, on the other hand, studied changes over a six-year period in the goals (and perceptions of them) of 68 comprehensive and secular universities in America.

26. The impending shortage, or diminished pool for selection, of future faculty scholars has received prominent attention from, for example, Jaroslav Pelikan (Scholarship and Its Survival, 1983) and Howard Bowen (American Professors - A National Resource Imperiled, 1986). In California, a report to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, "California Community College Reform" (Sacramento, 1987) states that the Community Colleges "will face a severe hiring crisis in the next fifteen years" and that ". . . fully 55

percent of current full-time faculty will retire in that period," and that "the availability of qualified persons to fill these positions in in doubt." The Committee, in CFCF, urges that "every (university) graduate student be offered the opportunity . . . to develop his/her teaching capacities" with the institution providing "pedagogical assistance" (p. 98).

27. A. Savel'iev, "Trends and Problems in . . . Higher Education in the Soviet Union," **Higher Education in Europe**, Vol. XVI, No. 3, 1991; UNESCO European Ctr. for Higher Education, Bucharest.

28. ONPV, pp. 129, 133, 150, 157-160. The term "rectors" actually is used more specifically in the documents of enabling actions by the Central Committee of the Party. Cf. "On the Enhanced Role of VUZy in Quickening Scientific-Technical Progress and Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education," and "On Increasing the Pay of Workers in VUZy" (i.e. higher education institutions); Pravda, Mar. 27-28, 1987.